IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

333 007 22 FM 1: 01

AND STORMAN OF STORMAN STORMAN

A STATE OF THE STA	_	\$ \$2 % \$ &u.	14 - E.
ELOUISE PEPION COBELL, et al.,) -		Sec. 123.38
)		
Plaintiffs,)		
,)		
V.	í	Case No. 1:96CV01285	5
)	(Judge Lamberth)	•
GALE A. NORTON, Secretary of the Interior, et al.	,)	(suage Lamoera)	
)		
Defendants.)		
)		
	. /		

INTERIOR DEFENDANTS' MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO SUBMIT BILL OF COSTS

Interior Defendants respectfully oppose plaintiffs' motion for enlargement of time, dated October 15, 2003, in which plaintiffs request up to and including December 15, 2003, for the purpose of "fil[ing] their bill of costs." Plaintiffs' Motion ("Pl. Mot.") at 1. As is explained below, this Court should deny plaintiffs' motion for two reasons.

First, although plaintiffs assert in their two-sentence motion that they need the enlargment of time to "file their bill of costs," Pl. Mot. at 1, plaintiffs do not explain the basis for their claim of entitlement to submit a bill of costs. Given the timing of plaintiffs' motion, plaintiffs presumably are seeking an enlargement of time to submit a bill of costs with regard to the Court's Order Issuing Structural Injunction following the Phase 1.5 trial. Cobell v. Norton, No. 1:96CV01285 (Order Issuing Structural Injunction) (filed Sept. 25, 2003). Assuming that to be the case, the simple fact is that the Court's Order Issuing Structural Injunction was silent with

Local Civil Rule 54.1(a) provides, in part, "A bill of costs must be filed within 20 days after entry of judgment terminating the case as to the party seeking costs, unless the time is extended by the court." For purposes of this rule, only the Court's September 25, 2003 Order Issuing Structural Injuction would constitute such a judgment. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(a) ("Judgment' as used in these rules includes a decree and any order from which an appeal lies.").

regard to the awarding of costs. Moreover, to the extent plaintiffs rely upon either the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA"), 28 U.S.C. § 2412(a), or Local Civil Rule 54.1, such a recovery is only available to a prevailing party. Given the Court's rejection of plaintiffs' plans submitted to the Court in January 2003, plaintiffs cannot be a "prevailing" party for purposes of EAJA or Local Civil Rule 54.1 awards.

Second, regardless of whether plaintiffs could argue that they are entitled to an award under EAJA or Local Civil Rule 54.1, plaintiffs' motion simply provides no explanation for their request of an enlargement under December 15, 2003 to submit their bill of costs. Plaintiffs' motion simply states the conclusion that they request the enlargement "[g]iven the complexity of compiling, sorting and finalizing the information necessary for a complete and accurate statement of costs in this matter." Pl. Mot. at 1. On its face, this is insufficient justification for plaintiffs' request for a two-month enlargement.²

Conclusion

Plaintiffs have neither explained any basis for their claim of entitlement to submit a bill of costs nor the reason that they purportedly need another two months to prepare their submission. For the foregoing reasons, we respectfully request that the Court deny plaintiffs' motion for enlargement of time to submit a bill of costs.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT D. McCALLUM, JR. Associate Attorney General

Inasmuch as the Phase 1.5 trial concluded with closing arguments on July 8, 2003, plaintiffs already have had well over three months to compile, sort, and finalize the bulk of any cost claims related to the trial.

PETER D. KEISLER Assistant Attorney General

STUART E. SCHIFFER
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

J. CHRISTOPHER KOHN

Director

SANDRA P. SPOONER

Deputy Director

JOHN T. STEMPLEWICZ

Senior Trial Attorney

JOHN WARSHAWSKY (D.C. Bar No. 417170)

Trial Attorney

Commercial Litigation Branch

Civil Division

P.O. Box 875

Ben Franklin Station

Washington, D.C. 20044-0875

Telephone: (202) 514-7194

October 22, 2003

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ELOUISE PEPION COBELL, et al.,)
EBOOISB I BI TOIT COBEBC, or all.,)
Plaintiffs,))
V.) Case No. 1:96CV01285) (Judge Lamberth)
GALE A. NORTON, Secretary of the Interior, et a	, , , , ,
Defendants.)))
ORD	<u>ER</u>
This matter comes before the Court on Plan	intiffs' Motion for Enlargement of Time, filed
October 15, 2003. After considering that motion,	Interior Defendants' opposing memorandum,
plaintiffs' reply, if any, and the record of the case,	the Court finds that the motion for enlargement
should be, and hereby is, DENIED.	
SO ORDERED this day of	, 2003.
	ROYCE C. LAMBERTH
	United States District Judge

Sandra P. Spooner
John T. Stemplewicz
Cynthia L. Alexander
Commercial Litigation Branch
Civil Division
P.O. Box 875
Ben Franklin Station
Washington, D.C. 20044-0875
Fax (202) 514-9163

Dennis M Gingold, Esq. Mark Brown, Esq. 1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Ninth Floor Washington, D.C. 20004 Fax (202) 318-2372

Keith Harper, Esq. Richard A. Guest, Esq. Native American Rights Fund 1712 N Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20036-2976 Fax (202) 822-0068

Elliott Levitas, Esq. 1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800 Atlanta, GA 30309-4530

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I declare under penalty of perjury that, on October 22, 2003 I served the foregoing *Interior Defendants' Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Enlargement of Time to Submit Bill of Costs* by facsimile in accordance with their written request of October 31, 2001 upon:

Keith Harper, Esq. Richard A. Guest, Esq. Native American Rights Fund 1712 N Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036-2976 (202) 822-0068

Dennis M. Gingold, Esq. Mark Kester Brown, Esq. 607 - 14th Street, NW, Box 6 Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 318-2372

Per the Court's Order of April 17, 2003, by facsimile and by U.S. Mail upon:

Earl Old Person (*Pro se*) Blackfeet Tribe P.O. Box 850 Browning, MT 59417 (406) 338-7530 By U.S. Mail upon:

Elliott Levitas, Esq 1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800 Atlanta, GA 30309-4530

Kevin P. Kingston